

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/647,925	08/26/2003		Donald Ray Disney	03692.P054D2	2438		
27660	7590	07/02/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
BURGESS & 800 WEST EI			LOKE, STEVEN HO YIN				
SUITE 180	CAMIN	OICLAL		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MOUNTAIN	VIEW, C	CA 94040	2811				

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/647,925	DISNEY, DONALD RAY				
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Steven Loke	2811				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE!	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this con D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	, nmunication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 A	<u>oril 2004</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 46-49 and 51-54 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Claim(s) <u>46-49 and 51-54</u> is/are rejected.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
D)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National S	Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/6/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	-152)			

Art Unit: 2811

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 46-49 and 51-54 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7, 8 and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,465,291 (Disney). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present application and the Disney patent disclose (in regards to claim 46) a method of fabricating complementary high-voltage field-effect transistors (HVFETS) in a substrate of a first conductivity type (lines 1-3 of claim 7), comprising: forming first and second well regions of a second conductivity type in the substrate (lines 4-6 of claim 7); forming a first source region in the substrate adjacent the first well region (lines 26-28 of claim 7); forming a first drain region of the second conductivity type in the first well region (lines 25-26 of claim 7); forming second and third drain regions of the first conductivity type in the second well region, the second drain region being separated from the third drain region (lines 14-21 of claim 7); forming a second source region being separated from the second drain region

Art Unit: 2811

(lines 14-24 of claim 7); forming first and second buried layers within the first and second well regions, respectively, the second buried layer being connected to the second and third drain regions (lines 7-10 and 33-38 of claim 7); and forming first and second insulated gates (lines 11-13 of claim 7).

In regards to claim 47, Disney further discloses the first insulated gate is formed above an area of the substrate that separates the first source region from the first well region (lines 11-13 and 30-32 of claim 7).

In regards to claim 48, Disney further discloses the second insulated gate is formed above an area of the second well region that separates the second source region from the second drain region (lines 11 and 21-24 of claim 7).

In regards to claim 49, Disney further discloses the first conductivity type is P-type (lines 1-2 of claim 8) and Disney inherently discloses the second conductivity type is N-type.

In regards to claim 51, Disney discloses a method of fabricating complementary power transistors in a substrate of a first conductivity type (lines 1-3 of claim 7). It comprising: forming first and second well regions of a second conductivity type opposite to the first conductivity type in the substrate (lines 4-6 of claim 7); forming first and second drain regions of the first conductivity type in the first well region, the second drain region being separated from the first drain region (lines 14-21 of claim 7); forming a third drain region of the second conductivity type in the second well region (lines 25-26 of claim 7); forming first and second buried layers within the first and second well regions, respectively, the first buried layer adjoining the first and second drain regions

Art Unit: 2811

(lines 7-10 and 33-38 of claim 7); and forming first and second insulated gates (lines 11-13 of claim 7).

In regards to claim 52, Disney further discloses the first conductivity type is P-type (lines 1-2 of claim 8).

In regards to claim 53, Disney further discloses the first and second buried layers are formed simultaneously by implanting a first dopant (lines 7-10 of claim 7 and lines 1-3 of claim 10).

In regards to claim 54, Disney differs from the claim invention by not showing the dopant is boron. It would have been obvious for the dopant is boron, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Loke whose telephone number is (571) 272-1657. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:50 am to 5:20 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,925 Page 5

Art Unit: 2811

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sl June 29, 2004 Steven Loke Primary Examiner